

On August 19, 1919, the defendant having failed to appear, the \$25 collateral that had theretofore been deposited by him to insure his appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7618. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Winfield E. Overton. Collateral of \$100 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 508-c.)

On August 19, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Winfield E. Overton, Colesville, Md., alleging the shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on August 13, 1919, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, of a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On August 19, 1919, the defendant having failed to appear, the \$100 collateral that had theretofore been deposited by him to insure his appearance was ordered forfeited by the court.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7619. Adulteration of cottonseed meal. U. S. * * * v. 600 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 510-c.)

On April 30, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the director of the Massachusetts Agricultural Experiment Station, Amherst, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 600 sacks of cottonseed meal, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Waltham, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by E. Crosby & Co., Brattleboro, Vt., and transported from the State of Vermont into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it contained a substance low in protein which had been substituted wholly or in part for the article, and for the further reason that a substance low in protein had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On June 10, 1919, Lyle & Lyle, Huntsville, Ala., claimants, having consented to a degree, and filed a good and sufficient bond in conformity with section 10 of the act, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and upon labeling the product, "Protein 32% Cottonseed Meal with Added Hulls."

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7620. Adulteration of Molletts B Feed Meal White and Molletts B Feed Meal Yellow. U. S. * * * v. 200 Bags of Molletts B Feed Meal White and 400 Bags of Molletts B Feed Meal Yellow. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Products ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 509-c.)

On or about July 12, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Dairy and Food Commissioner of the State of Virginia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said

district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 200 bags of Molletts B Feed Meal White and 400 bags of Molletts B Feed Meal Yellow, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Newport News, Va., alleging that the articles had been shipped on or about October 3, 1918, by the Lake Erie Milling Co., Toledo, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Virginia, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article in each case was alleged in the libels for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, ground corn cob, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality or strength, and had been substituted wholly or in part for the article.

On or about August 6, 1919, the said Lake Erie Milling Co., claimant, having consented to the entry of decrees, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bonds in the aggregate sum of \$3,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7621. Misbranding of Estrellita Brand Pure Refined Vegetable Oil Compounded with Pure Olive Oil. U. S. * * * v. Massolo Oil Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 11345. I. S. No. 16242-r.)

On February 19, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Massolo Oil Co., a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on September 21, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Florida, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Estrellita Brand Pure Refined Vegetable Oil Compounded with Pure Olive Oil for Salad and Cooking," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the product to consist largely of cottonseed and peanut oils and to be short volume.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statements borne on the label, to wit, "Vegetable Oil Compounded with Pure Olive Oil" and "One Gallon Net," were false and misleading in that they represented to purchasers of the article that same was compounded with olive oil in an appreciable proportion, and that each can contained not less than 1 gallon of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchasers into the belief that it was compounded with olive oil in an appreciable proportion, and that each can thereof contained not less than 1 gallon of the article, whereas, in fact and in truth, it was not compounded with an appreciable proportion of olive oil, and each can did not contain 1 gallon thereof. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents thereof was not marked on the outside of the package in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count.

On March 10, 1920, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*